

Appl. No. 10/604,292
Amdt. dated January 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of November 18, 2004

Amendments to the Drawings:

Replacement drawings are submitted to provide drawings having lines that are uniformly thick and well defined.

5 Attachment: Six (6) Replacement Sheets

Appl. No. 10/604,292
Amdt. dated January 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of November 18, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Objection to the figures:

Figures 1-6 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.84 because all of the lines are not uniformly thick and well defined. Appropriate correction is required.

5

Response:

The applicant is submitting replacement sheets for each of the 6 pages of drawings, having figures 1-6 thereon. Acceptance of the drawings is respectfully requested.

10

2. Objection to the specification:

In paragraph 0004 of the specification, "PDA" and "RAM" have not been defined. Appropriate correction is required.

15

Response:

These two terms have been defined to eliminate any ambiguity. The definitions provided are those which one skilled in the art would have recognized, and as such, no new matter has been added through the addition of these definitions. Acceptance of the amended specification is requested.

20

3. Objection to the specification:

In various locations of both the specification and the claims, words have been combined together with no space left between the words. Appropriate correction is required.

25

Response:

The applicant has carefully read through the specification and the claims to identify and correct all instances where words have been combined together.

Appl. No. 10/604,292
Amdt. dated January 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of November 18, 2004

Acceptance of the corrected specification and claims is respectfully requested.

4. Objection to the specification:

5 In the last sentence of paragraph 0006 of the specification, it is not clear what the basis is for stating that the pressing of a manual button is an inconvenience to users. Appropriate explanation/correction is required.

Response:

10 The last sentence of paragraph 0006 has been amended. Paragraph 0006 now explains that since the operating processor 20 cannot operate immediately, the users experience delay as a result. No new matter has been added, and acceptance of the corrected specification is respectfully requested.

15 5. Objection to the claims:

Claims 1 and 12 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(i) because each element of these claims is not separated by a line indentation. Appropriate correction is required.

20 **Response:**

As shown in the Listing of Claims section above, claims 1 and 12 are each formatted so that each element of the claims is indented. Acceptance of the corrected claims 1 and 12 is respectfully requested.

25 6. Objection to the specification:

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. There is no antecedent basis in the specification for "pulse signal" which is found in claims 9 and 18.

Appl. No. 10/604,292
Amtd. dated January 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of November 18, 2004

Response:

Claims 9 and 18 are cancelled, and are therefore no longer in need of consideration.

5

7. Objection to the claims:

Claims 1-20 are objected to for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The preamble of claim 1 cites "A portable device..." but a portable device for what exactly is being referred to here? Appropriate correction is required.

10

Response:

The applicant has amended the claims to correct the preamble of each of the claims, to correct the problems in which no spaces were left between words, and to change "installed the battery" to "installed in the battery". The preamble of the claims now reads, "A portable electronic device" instead of "A portable device". The claims are directed at any portable electronic device which runs on battery power, and therefore the word "electronic" has been added to the preamble of the claims. Acceptance of the corrected claims 1-20 is respectfully requested.

20

8. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 8, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1, 2, 8, 10, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Eguchi et al. (6,087,803) for reasons of record, as recited on pages 4-5 of the above-indicated Office action.

25

Response:

The applicant has amended claim 1 to overcome this rejection. Limitations previously found in original claim 3 have been moved to claim 1 to patentably distinguish claim 1 from the AAPA and Eguchi et al.

Appl. No. 10/604,292
Amtd. dated January 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of November 18, 2004

Claim 1 now contains a limitation further limiting the sensor, which is copied below:

5 "the sensor comprising a conducting port for detecting if the type of the detachable battery is correct, for detecting if the power volume of the detachable battery is sufficient, and for detecting if the detachable battery is correctly installed in the battery vessel;"

10 On the other hand, neither the AAPA nor Eguchi et al. teach detecting if the type of the detachable battery is correct, detecting if the power volume of the detachable battery is sufficient, or detecting if the detachable battery is correctly installed in the battery vessel. Eguchi, in column 3 lines 15 29-33, only teaches detecting whether a battery pack is electrically connected to the electronic equipment. Therefore, the currently amended claim 1 is patentably distinct from the AAPA and Eguchi et al., either alone or in combination. Claims 2, 8, 10, and 11 are dependent on claim 1 and should be allowed if claim 1 is allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 8, 10, and 11 is respectfully requested.

20 9. Rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Eguchi et al. (6,087,803), and further in view of Hughes et al. (6,420,854) for reasons of record, as recited on page 6 of the above-indicated Office action.

25 **Response:**
Claims 9 and 18 are cancelled, and are no longer in need of consideration.

In view of the above, applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of

Appl. No. 10/604,292
Amdt. dated January 28, 2005
Reply to Office action of November 18, 2004

Allowance be issued in this case.

5

Sincerely yours,

Winston Hsu

Date: January 28, 2005

- Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526
10 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.
Voice Mail: 302-729-1562
Facsimile: 806-498-6673
e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com
- 15 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. The time difference between D.C. and Taiwan is 13 hours. The preferred time period for telephone conversation is 7 AM (or earlier) – 11 AM, D.C. time.
- 20 Attachments